

Application No. 10/554,077

May 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2008

Page 6 of 11

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5.

Attachment: One Replacement Sheet.

Application No. 10/554,077

May 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2008

Page 7 of 11

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 15-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS

**Fig. 5** and Claim 15 and CANCELS Claims 18 and 20.

Applicant affirms election of Claims 15-17, 22, and 25-28. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 is generic to Claims 19, 21, 23, and 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow Claims 19, 21, 23, and 24 upon allowing Claim 15. Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application to pursue Claims 18 and 20.

In Section No. 3 on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings for failing to designate Fig. 5 as --Prior Art--. Applicant has amended Fig. 5 to properly be designated as --Prior Art--. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings.

On page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 15, 17, 22, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakanishi et al. (U.S. 2003/0197813). On page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Kato (U.S. 2003/0011735). On page 8 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. On page 8 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. in view of Park et al. (U.S. 2003/0020401).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 15-17, 22, and 25-28.

Applicant's Claim 15 recites:

A display device, comprising:

a display element having a display function; and

a functional element having a function different from that of the display element; wherein:

the functional element is laminated on the display element so as to be confined in a planar area of the display element; and

the display element includes a thin film substrate;

**the thin film substrate has provided directly thereon:**

**a circuit block of a display system that is arranged to process an externally inputted video signal so as to drive the display section and**

May 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2008

Page 8 of 11

**that includes a plurality of transistors arranged in an array to control corresponding pixels of the display element; and**

**a circuit block of a separate system that is arranged to process a signal regarding the functional element; and**

the circuit block of the separate system receives and sends the signal through a flexible printed circuit board which is connected to the thin film substrate and which enables connection to an external device. (emphasis added)

In Section No. 5 on pages 5 and 6 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that **Fig. 6** of Nakanishi et al. teaches each of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 15. In the third line of Section No. 5 on page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly refers to Yamada. Applicant believes that the Examiner intended to refer to Nakanishi et al., instead of Yamada, because (1) the statement of the rejection only indicates that the Examiner relied upon Nakanishi et al. and (2) the reference numbers and figures discussed in the body of the rejection match up with Nakanishi et al.

Nakanishi et al. is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because Nakanishi et al. was published on October 23, 2003, which is not one year before Applicant's filing date of February 20, 2004 (the filing date of the corresponding PCT application).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakanishi et al.

In anticipation of the Examiner relying upon Nakanishi et al. in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicant has amended Claim 15 to recite the features of:

the thin film substrate has provided directly thereon:

a circuit block of a display system that is arranged to process an externally inputted video signal so as to drive the display section and that includes a plurality of transistors arranged in any array to control corresponding pixels of the display element; and

a circuit block of a separate system that is arranged to process a signal regarding the functional element.

These features are not taught or suggested by Nakanishi et al.

In the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that LCD device **43** of Nakanishi et al. corresponds to the display element as recited in Applicant's Claim 15 and that control circuit **44** of Nakanishi et al. corresponds to the thin film

May 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2008

Page 9 of 11

substrate as recited in Applicant's Claim 15. However, as seen in **Fig. 6** of Nakanishi et al., the control circuit **44** of Nakanishi et al. fails to include any transistors that control the pixels of the LCD device **43** as recited in Applicant's Claim 15. Although not shown in the drawings of Nakanishi et al., the LCD device **43** might inherently include a substrate having transistors for controlling the pixels of the LCD device **43**. However, there is absolutely no hint or suggestion in Nakanishi et al. that any such substrate of the LCD device **43** having the transistors would include a circuit block of a separate system as recited in Applicant's Claim 15. It is clear from **Fig. 6** of Nakanishi et al. by the lack of any flexible wiring board connecting the LCD device **43** and the transparent touch panel **41** that no substrate of the LCD device **43** includes a circuit block arranged to process any signals regarding the transparent touch panel **41**.

Thus, Nakanishi et al. fails to teach or suggest the features recited in Applicant's Claim 15 of:

the thin film substrate has provided directly thereon:

a circuit block of a display system that is arranged to process an externally inputted video signal so as to drive the display section and that includes a plurality of transistors arranged in any array to control corresponding pixels of the display element; and

a circuit block of a separate system that is arranged to process a signal regarding the functional element.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a prior art rejection of Claim 15 based upon Nakanishi et al. would be improper.

The Examiner has relied upon Kato and Park et al. to allegedly cure various deficiencies in Nakanishi et al. However, Kato and Park et al., applied alone or in combination with Nakanishi et al., fail to teach or suggest the features of:

the thin film substrate has provided directly thereon:

a circuit block of a display system that is arranged to process an externally inputted video signal so as to drive the display section and that includes a plurality of transistors arranged in any array to control corresponding pixels of the display element; and

a circuit block of a separate system that is arranged to process a signal regarding the functional element

in combination with the other features recited in Applicant's Claim 15.

Application No. 10/554,077

May 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2008

Page 10 of 11

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 15 of the present application. Claims 16, 17, 22, and 25-28 depend upon Claim 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 15 is allowable. As noted above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow Claims 19, 21, 23, and 24 upon allowing Claim 15.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2008

/Peter Medley #56,125/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
Peter Medley  
Registration No. 56,125